DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 233 JC 690 274

By-Wiegman, Robert R.

General Education in Occupational Education Programs Offered by Junior Colleges.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 69
Note-25p.
Available from-American Association of Junior Colleges, 1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($1.50)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
Descriptors-*Educational Innovation, *General Education, Higher Education, Innovation, *Instructional Innovation, *Junior Colleges, *Vocational Education

This report, directed toward junior college board members, presidents, deans, department heads, and teachers, as well as legislators, attempts to stimulate thought and action to improve general education in occupational programs offered by junior colleges. Following a review of the unsatisfactory status of present curricula, a rationale and proposal for providing more adequately for students' total needs were presented. Desired changes within general education offerings include opportunities for students to become acquainted with the requirements of their future employers; to participate in on-the-job training programs; to develop cognitive skill, attitudes, and self-concept during in- and out-of-classroom activities; to become acquainted with aesthetic, literary, and intellectual areas; and to develop community awareness. In addition to the evaluation and modification of course offerings to insure up-to-date, relevant curricula, other aspects of the total college environment that require attention and change include: the physical plant, the nonclassroom environment, the attitudes and procedures of the counseling, teaching, and service personnel, and classroom structures. Desirable outcomes that may result from these innovations were discussed. (MB)

ED031233

general education

occupational education programs offered by junior colleges ■ by Robert R. Wiegman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JC 690 274

"The revised concept of general education sees it as more than what is to be taught and how much; it is also concerned with how it is taught, by whom, for what purpose, and under what circumstances."

Robert R. Wiegman (page 17)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY THE AUTHOR + AMERICAN ASSN. OF JUNIOR COLLEGES TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Price: $1.50

Copyright 1969: American Association of Junior Colleges

1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036
Printed in U.S.A.

preface

One of the American Association of Junior Colleges' principal objectives is the promotion of sound growth in American community and junior colleges. The Association's program of leadership and service to over 790 member institutions has included conferences and meetings, consultant services, and many publications.

Occupational education has been a long continuing interest of the Association. The support of the *W. K. Kellogg Foundation* of Battle Creek, Michigan, has enabled the Association to develop concerted programs to support occupational education and to establish the Occupational Education Project with a group of specialists assigned to the Washington headquarters.

The programs of the Project include opening channels of communication, the identifying of consultants competent in specific occupational education areas, planning and holding of regional workshops for community college personnel, along with the publication of many guideline-type booklets. In addition, the OEP staff participates widely in the activities of many other associations and agencies that are concerned with occupational education.

The publication program has three facets: (1) the periodical *Occupational Education Bulletin,* (2) a series of curriculum guides, and (3) a series of service area publications.

The service area publications deal with issues that cut across many of the interests of occupational educators and are designed to fill a gap where few materials of specific interest to junior college educators exist. One service area which has been of considerable concern to the Association for a long time is the place of general education in occupational education programs in the junior college. The Commission on Curriculum of the Association has had for some time a subcommittee concerned with this subject. The most recent chairman of that subcommittee is Robert R. Wiegman, dean of the College of Education, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida. Dr. Wiegman, whose experiences and interests in education are extensive and varied, including an association with the junior college movement spanning two decades, agreed to serve as author for this publication. He has been assisted in writing this booklet by having an advisory committee against which he could test his ideas. These persons are: Charles E. Chapman, president, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio; Amo DeBernardis, president, Portland Community College, Portland, Oregon; Richard F. Grego, president, Sullivan County Community College, South Fallsburg, New York; Thomas Merson, dean of instruction, Bakersfield College, Kern Joint Junior College District, Bakersfield, California; and Harriet Withers, chairman, Department of Business Information Systems, Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Florida.

The Occupational Education Project staff believes that this monograph will stimulate thought and action in this important area of the junior college.

Lewis R. Fibel
Specialist in Occupational Education
American Association of Junior Colleges

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 23 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

table of contents

Preface 1

Foreword 3

Chapter I 5

The Junior College Today

Chapter II 11

Tomorrow's Citizens and Employees

Chapter III 16

The Rationale

Chapter IV 20

The Proposal

Chapter V 28

The Challenge

foreword

If you are a member of a junior college board or a president, dean or department head in a junior college, this brochure is for you because the power to allocate resources is in your hands.

If you are a legislator in a state that has a state system of junior colleges, this brochure is for you because the power to make funds available is in your vote.

If you are a teacher in a junior college, this brochure is for you because only you and your colleagues have the power to translate resources into action that will accomplish the purposes that undergird general education in occupational programs.

Our concern in this brochure, sponsored and published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, admittedly is not a new one. You will recognize it as one which has been on the agenda many times — the matter of general education in occupational education programs offered by junior colleges.

"Then why," you ask, "are we forced to face this problem once again?" And I answer, "Because: so far, a satisfactory solution has not been advanced. At a time when the junior college in general is approaching maturity, with its purposes and goals in rather sharp focus and its acceptance as a legitimate step on the ladder of educational opportunity, the occupational program seems to rest on constantly shifting sands. Resolution continues to be elusive, in spite of the many discussions which have tended to tear faculties apart and set old friends at each other's throats. The dichotomy continues to exist: the traditionalist vs. the innovator; the academician vs. the occupationalist. An urgency should be currently recognized for finding the right solution in this age of rapidly moving developments and technological advancements.

By reviewing for you the current status of the junior college and by calling your attention to its unique place in higher education for a unique group of students, we hope to:

1. Stimulate your thinking
2. Strengthen your determination to see things as they are
3. Support you in your efforts to improve occupational offerings — to make them ever more acceptable as preparation for the employment world and, indeed, for life itself
4. Suggest an acceptable, expanded concept of general education.

We are dealing with one of the most vexing and elusive problems which confront the junior college, and nothing will be done about it unless you are convinced of the need.

Robert R. Wiegman
Dean of The College of Education
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Florida

CHAPTER 1

The Junior College Today

"The ludicrous posture of an ostrichlike higher education establishment with its feathers high and its head in the sand, wishing that these educational needs of the nation would go away so that peaceful academic browsing might be resumed, is one which is less and less likely to amuse Americans in the future. The plumes are apt to be unceremoniously plucked by an irate public demand that higher education strut out in step with the 20th Century."[1]

— Norman Harris

Status Today

The junior college today is hailed as "an educational movement unparalleled in human history," "a phenomenon of the twentieth century," "the only really American innovation in higher education," "the institution that has grown more rapidly than any other segment of American higher education," "an important segment of post-high school education in the United States with the promise of becoming the largest and most important," "an essential segment of American higher education," "an institution in close relationship to the society it was created to serve," "the relatively new institution which is freest from the heavy hand of tradition," "a unique institution."

What a recital of desirable attributes!

New, different, unusual, important, essential, American, fast-growing, unique; has great promise, is free from tradition, created by society, responsible to society. To be an institution in these categories is tremendous, exciting, invigorating, challenging. These glowing descriptions make it appear that the junior college has really arrived and is free to step right out to do its part in meeting the post-secondary educational needs of society in America.

But is this really so? Can these things be truthfully said about the junior college, or are they only hopes? If they are only hopes, what keeps them from being realities? Who and what is responsible? How does your college measure up?

A closer look reveals that instead of being the unique, free-from-tradition, instrument-of-society type of institution, the junior college has many of its policies and practices dictated by four-year colleges whose objectives are quite different from the junior college. In spite of its obligation to serve the society which created it, and in spite of the recognition that society has peculiar needs which the junior college was created to serve, some institutions have not dared depart from these "proven" policies and practices. Some critics even have dubbed the junior college a "poor imitation of the four-year college." Is this true of your college?

---

[1]Norman C. Harris. "Developments in Technical and Vocational Education," *New Dimensions in Higher Education*, No. 23, Everett Hopkins, editor, Office of Education, United States Office of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., April 1967. pp. 44-45.

Facts and Figures

Certainly, one fact in the introductory assessment is true: the fantastic, unprecedented growth in enrollment and in the number of institutions. Although junior college growth is a well-known fact, a look at it at this point is not out of order, for it has a great deal to do with what is to be found on today's junior college campuses.

In less than fifty years, the junior college has become a gigantic undertaking, with the really dramatic growth taking place in the last few years; the enrollment has doubled just since 1962. *The 1968 Directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges* reports 912 institutions with an enrollment of 1,671,440. New schools have been opening during the last several years at the rate of forty to fifty per year, but the year 1967 topped the list with seventy-two.[2]

The prediction is that by 1970 the number of institutions will have reached 1,000 and the enrollment 2 million. These figures are not idle guesses; they hold tremendous significance for the junior college.

How will this institution reach out to meet the needs of society?

Each institution will have to answer the question of meeting society's needs for itself. A refusal to see itself as an instrument of society assigned to a unique task will effectively deprive the junior college of achieving its full potential. Much is expected of the newer colleges because they are new and because the people who have established them have recognized the demands of society to bring post-secondary education within the reach of all youth.

Research is hardly needed to uncover the relationship between the growth of the junior college and the great social and economic circumstances that have taken place in America. There was a time when "to be educated" or "not to be educated" was not a prime

—— Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *Report on Occupational Education in the South*, Vol. 19:8; Atlanta, Georgia: the Association, May 1967. p. 11.

problem; the emphasis was on survival. Today, paradoxically, survival seems to be closely related to the amount of education a person has. American society has moved through the stage when an eighth grade education was the price for removing one's name from the list of the uneducated and is approaching the stage when even a high school diploma is not sufficient. Recognizing this, the nation's youth, high school diplomas (the price of admission) in their hands, stand at the doors of the junior college.

Quite generally, four-year institutions were unprepared for the waves of increased enrollment resulting from such legislation as federal aid for veterans and they chose to solve their problem by raising tuition and admission requirements. Now it is small wonder that enrollments in junior colleges have grown.

Growth has been especially marked in the junior colleges with the open-door admission policy. No one can deny that there is a very real relationship between the remarkable growth of the junior college and the changes which have taken place in society, in American values, and in the American way of life itself. So, the junior college is accepting the student with his high

[2] American Association of Junior Colleges. *Directory of American Association of Junior Colleges*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1968. p. 7.

school diploma and sometimes, if he is old enough, without a diploma. In return the junior college should give him more than a university parallel program and ensure that society's demands are being met.

An Inventory Needed

If excellence is determined by the degree to which one's goals are met, and many believe that it is, then let the policy-makers of all junior colleges look to their goals. Let the excellence of the institution be determined on the basis of what an examination of its goals reveals; and let the examination take into account not only twentieth century needs, but also the demands of the twenty-first century already projecting their images before us. Such an examination does not happen accidentally. It must be carefully planned; it must be completely comprehensive.

The purpose of this publication is to urge that the attention of such an examination be focused specifically on the quality of general education in occupational curriculums. What is the situation in the junior college today regarding occupational curriculums, particularly general education?

Although in many junior colleges the major objective has been, and still is, a program for transfer students, it is by no means the only choice available. Society has called the junior college into being to train students for life, which of necessity must include some kind of employment. Accordingly, some seven out of eight junior colleges offer occupational curriculums; but the students are often reluctant to choose them. Why?

Faults in Occupational Curriculums. Some of the reasons given for this reluctance are that these curriculums carry no prestige, do not lead to a degree, and are outdated; that textbooks and equipment are obsolete; that libraries are inadequate; and that occupational students have no status.

Current statistics indicate that two-thirds of the entering freshmen plan to transfer but that actually only one-third do transfer. This is in part accounted for by the lack of prestige which occupational curriculums carry, plus the fact that many students are not transfer material. Often they have enrolled for the transfer program under parental pressure. Furthermore, the transfer program is older, better known, and more vigorous. Students want to be associated with success, and the transfer program is reasonably successful.

What happens to the one-third that does not transfer? Some drop out; perhaps it would be more accurate to say that they are "pushed" out by circumstances which could have been changed. Some complete the associate degree pattern and then terminate. And some shift to the occupational curriculums.

> "Most vocational educators confirm [that] broader than supplying [skills], they [want] their students to be well prepared for the society in which they will live as well as for the [society] in which they work."
>
> —— Southern Association of Colleges and Schools *Report on Occupational Education in the South*. Vol. 19:8; Atlanta, Georgia: the Association, May 1967. p. 16.

There need be no apology for such a shift, which one should be able to accomplish quite easily within the same college, but all too often it carries a stigma; more than likely the student will be disappointed and dissatisfied with the work to which he is assigned, especially if it prepares him for jobs no longer in existence and requires courses in general education which he has been conditioned to dislike.

Furthermore, he may have to go to the far corner of the campus, if not off the campus, to get to class (which gives us a clue as to which program is considered important).

The lack of prestige for occupational curriculums is felt inside the college where, traditionally, vocational education has been looked down upon by many academic educators, and it is also felt outside the college where the public shares much the same attitude plus one of indifference.

Unrelenting concern for "academic respectability" has robbed many occupational curriculums of appeal to able students while it fostered "educational snobbery."

Something must be wrong with current occupational offerings; with what is offered, with how it is offered, and with the circumstances under which it is offered. There are literally thousands of jobs available today which require post-secondary education of two years or less in duration. These jobs cover a wide range of aptitudes and they are well-rewarded jobs. Why is it that training for such jobs is not being offered, and why are students not enrolling in these programs when they are offered?

Business, industry, and labor stand ready to help educators provide the necessary training by furnishing advisors, grants, and, often, instructors. Why the lag? What will happen to the now rapid economic development if there is an inadequate supply of well-trained craftsmen and technicians? How is industry to recruit its needed thousands of highly trained personnel? Where is the army of skilled employees needed in industry to be found? What will happen if the millions who are now ill prepared to seize existing employment opportunities — and the list grows annually by the thousands — remain ill prepared?

Answers to these questions are closely related to the matter of providing the right kinds of occupational

---

Fifty years ago — Alfred North Whitehead said:

"There can be no education [technical education] which is not liberal and no liberal education which is not technical."

Forty years ago — Leonard V. Koos said:

"... among the basic purposes of the junior college there should be provision of opportunities for rounding out [their] general education."

Twenty years ago — Phoebe Ward said:

"As a result of the economic and social forces that have been at work in the United States, every junior college should dedicate its terminal education program to the two-fold task of developing workers for business and industry and at the same time molding these potential workers into individual citizens who are to determine the place that America will maintain in the world of nations."

— These three quotations were reported by Edwin E. Potter, Jr., "An Analysis of Attitudes of Students, Teachers, and Administrators Toward General Education Programs of Selected Junior Colleges of Florida," an unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, August 1961, pp. 53-55.

---

curriculums in the junior college, in making them attractive to entering students, acceptable to the academic faculty members, and valued by our society.

Where else can you find solutions to so many of the problems of poverty, unemployment, and social and racial unrest?

There is no denying that most junior colleges offer occupational curriculums of some type, but many of them need to be revised, updated, and upgraded if they are to be sought and selected.

Faults in General Education Offerings. Occupational education cannot be dismissed until the general education phase of it is determined and described. Indeed, we might begin by asking, "Do you think that general education has any part in occupational education?" Most junior college presidents and faculties, when confronted with the question, would answer without hesitation, "Yes, of course." But if either or both were asked what their general education program and its objectives were, there would be a variety of answers.

Some would speak of it as the "core curriculum" or as the "required part." And an occupational instructor might even say that it is the part that keeps students out of occupational curriculums — and he would not be facetious. This does happen. Furthermore, even where the objectives of general education are stated in the catalog, there is often a gap between policy and practice. There is little difficulty finding evidence that general education is considered a necessary part of the occupational curriculums.

The junior college must become sufficiently independent to set up its own courses and plans for achieving its goals rather than basing its program on tradition and imitating what is being done in four-year institutions which have a different purpose: for then it will be well on its way to deserving recognition as a unique American innovation, free from tradition, created by society to serve society's needs.

"Any plan should give central recognition to the fact that general education is an essential element in preparation for employment.

Studies repeatedly reveal that workers more frequently lose positions because of a lack of general education than because of a deficiency in technical skills."

—— Johnson, B. Lamar. "Alternative Patterns for Post-Secondary Technical-Vocational Education." *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Legislative Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board.* Williamsburg, Virginia, August 27-29, 1964, p. 7.

Taking the lead in this independent action — let me repeat — will be the comparatively young junior colleges because young, vigorous institutions have the courage to try new things. Older institutions, like older people, tend to think in more fixed patterns because they feel comfortable with the old ways of doing things and are less likely to try new and daring things. New institutions are also less likely to be overly concerned with continuing traditions. Thus it is logical that these institutions should be leaders in resolving the dilemma which confronts and plagues both American higher education and American business, industry, and labor today. Change requires vision, courage, determination, hard work, and money.

CHAPTER II

Tomorrow's Citizens and Employees

"We possess only traditional measures to describe a student who does not fit the tradition. . . . The junior college student is less able — on our present tests; he is less intellectually oriented — on our present measures; and he is less motivated to seek higher education — in our traditional colleges."

— K. Patricia Cross

What is it that determines the offerings for tomorrow's citizens and employees? The blunt truth seems to be that they are very largely determined by tradition. If the college is a new one, it normally looks to the older colleges for a pattern — which usually is a traditional one. Frequently, the resultant training is unsatisfactory to the student and to the employer.

References are readily available which propose that the "needs of the students" should be a determining factor; there is, however, very little evidence found in reviews of current practices that this philosophy is followed. This criterion, the needs of the student — though not a new idea — is a basic consideration in the proposal which this publication will make.

The great majority of students will come from the immediate vicinity of the college. The students will live at home and commute daily. This will be true particularly of the students in community junior colleges for they have been located deliberately to make them available and accessible to a high percentage of the youth in each community. This fact should be carefully noted and appraised for the implications which it holds for program planning, scheduling, buildings, student activities, and other features of the campus which contribute to the student's education.

Enrollments are increasing so rapidly that if only one-third of the entering students continue to select occupational curriculums (the current proportion) the number will be huge. If updated and improved, occupational curriculums would carry more prestige and appeal to many more students.

On the other hand, there are thousands more who for various reasons are still unaware of the occupational preparation available to them. It has been estimated that only a scant 20 per cent of the nation's high school graduates complete four-year college programs. What happens to the remaining 80 per cent? The futures of all of them must of necessity be closely tied to the employment world. The 1967 Report *Progress of Public Education in the United States* sets the figure of high school graduates at 2,641,000.[4] Even half this number would be well over a million. It is believed

[3] K. Patricia Cross, *The Junior College Student: A Research Description*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968. p. 6.

[4] *Progress of Public Education in the United States of America 1966-67*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, p. 8.

that currently proposed occupational programs for junior colleges are within the abilities and interests of at least 50 per cent of the high school graduates and that for many of them such courses will best match their abilities; and we must add to this 50 per cent the masses of adults who seek an education or retraining for jobs in the evening sessions of the junior college.

Although a cross section of society is represented by students attending the junior college, the great majority of today's students come from homes of clerical, skilled, and unskilled workers. The more metropolitan the community is, the greater the representation from homes on the lower end of the socioeconomic scale. Most of the parents have a high school education or less. More mothers than fathers are high school graduates. In general, concern as to whether or not their children go to college is very low; but there are exceptions, which sometimes include unrealistic goals for the children. Little interest in cultural and civic causes and activities is manifested. There is even less discussion and participation in such activities. Most of the homes have little in the way of good magazines, books, and music. These are the homes of the typical lower "white collar" and "blue collar" workers, where life has been influenced by no more than minimal basic education.

Most of these students have not given adequate time and attention to long-term educational planning. The decision to go to college for the majority was made late in high school or even after graduation. A large percentage do not have well-defined attitudes toward the purposes of education, nor do they have a clear-cut picture of the requirements for the various semi-professional, scientific, and technical occupations. Some come because they expect better instruction from a more concerned faculty.

Many do not know what they want out of college or out of life; many of them were disillusioned, bored, uncaring, unproductive during high school; but after graduating (or leaving) they find that no jobs or only low-level jobs are available to them and that the junior college offers them a second chance to prove themselves. Some choose a junior college because it is less expensive and is readily accessible; some choose a junior college because of pressure from peers or counselors and, occasionally, from parents.

For some of them, the immediate goal is preparation for job entry. However, for most the ultimate goal is economic independence which will in turn provide the good housing, clothes, cars, and satisfying leisure activities and entertainment which will be theirs only if they have developed a marketable skill or talent.

The implications of these observations must not be overlooked by those who design curriculums and help the students plan their work.

Most of junior college students will be young. Approximately 20 per cent of last year's freshmen were nineteen or older. The typical junior college freshman is less sophisticated than the typical university freshman. Most of them have at least one thing in common: a high school diploma. And most of them will have earned it by completing a college preparatory curriculum — the only kind available.

The outstanding characteristic of the junior college student body is its heterogeneity. In general, the students will fall into three groups: the recent high school graduates, the college dropouts, and the adults. In each of the groups there will be a wide range in intelligence, aptitude, interests, and motivation. In each group will be found those who are potential semi-professional employees with a quick talent for acquiring highly technical skills which are in such heavy demand today. And each individual in each group will bring along his invisible bag of past experiences which will be the clue to many of his reactions on campus as well as to his needs.

Untrained and undertrained they come; and many in the adult group will come for retraining. There are more men than women. Some are married. Some have had work experience. Many of them are cost conscious; and many of them need part-time jobs. Many lack cultural advantages. They represent a cross-section of the community in which the college is located.

". . . the area is foggy and the image is cloudy, but the beclouded needs of decades ahead must not inhibit planning for the immediate future or delay solutions to current problems.

"The rising demand in the world of work is for highly skilled technicians and semi-professional specialists. Businessmen, along with officials and other employers, more and more need specialists in electronics and in dozens of semi-professional engineering skills; men and women who know Boolean algebra used in computer mathematics; medical technologists who can completely take over some of the non-professional and semi-professional duties now performed by doctors and nurses in health services (which has become the nation's third largest industry); electro-mechanical technicians who can accompany industry's shift to interrelated skills and technically-oriented clerical employees who can master processing and other complex equipment. Men and women are needed who can think, act, and react in ways demanded by the fast-paced world of assembly line, economy-minded manufacturing concerns and service businesses."

— Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *Report on Occupational Education in the South*, Vol. 19:8; Atlanta, Georgia: the Association, May 1967. p. 21.

In general, they are much more likely to listen for the voice of authority than to use reflective thinking for problem solving. Many of these students do not really see themselves as college material, partly because of their image of college as an "ivory tower." Their high school experiences and years of economic and cultural deprivation have made them feel insecure, uneasy, inadequate, and somewhat lost in most any situation — especially a new one. Helping them to see themselves as having worth, purpose, and dignity should be the first priority of the junior college.

Predicting what tomorrow's employment world will be like for these students is a difficult task. Some say that all routine work will soon be done by machines. Others say that new machines create as many jobs as they displace. One thing is certain: there will be change—change that will develop more rapidly than has ever been experienced in man's history. Today's students will more than likely have to prepare for a different job from the one they are now preparing for — perhaps more than once. A change may even mean a transfer to some other part of the country.

Working hours are almost certain to shrink to a twenty-five-or thirty-hour week. What will they do with the rest of their waking hours? For those who plan to take a second job, there is a distinct possibility that in the years ahead moonlighting will be as socially unacceptable as bigamy. There is also the possibility that the retirement age will be lowered, thus shortening the span of working years. Tomorrow's employment world will be full of changes which will confront the employee. The key is adaptability. If the employee can learn to adapt and adjust, change need not be catastrophic — merely something that a person who is conditioned to it, takes in stride.

The initial need of students is to have advisors and

teachers who are perceptive to their needs and who can give them a sense of direction, offering them a curriculum and college experiences which will fit their needs. They need help and understanding. Some need help in building a new self-image and in gaining self-confidence. Most of them need help in learning that self-confidence as well as dignity are tied up with the right choice of an occupation. They will need preparation for job entry. The jobs will need to match their interests and abilities, and should be available in their communities. The curriculums for this preparation will need to be flexible enough to match individual as well as group needs. (Policymakers and faculty must constantly keep in mind the fact that these students are an extremely heterogeneous group with a wide range of abilities and motivations.)

Students must be taught that the job they are preparing for is only the beginning — that they must plan to make job preparation a lifelong project and to be ready to adjust to whatever the changes demand. If the attitudes and concepts which they have developed so far are vague, incomplete, incorrect, or inadequate, it is vitally important that these shortcomings be discovered and remedied to the extent that is possible. General education holds the most satisfactory key to answering this need — that is, the kind of general education that this publication proposes.

To satisfy such a roster of needs is a tremendous assignment, but the prime purpose of the junior college is to serve the needs of society, whatever they may be. If the junior college can help students accept learning as a lifelong process for which they offer a plan and a pattern, these employees of tomorrow will be better prepared to work out their pattern independently throughout all the years of their lives.

Flexibility; adaptability; critical thinking; discriminating between fact and opinion; solving problems logically; developing a system of values; recognizing the need for continuing education; and seeing the need to become participating members of society — these are what students need as they enter the employment world. If the junior colleges awaken these abilities, aid in their early development, and create an awareness of their continued importance, a major part of the junior college mission will have been fulfilled.

Unless changes have taken place on junior college campuses faster than changes usually take place, what students are getting is a far cry from what they ought to have. Educational traditionalists still maintain a strong grip on American curriculums, and they are often the ones who determine what shall be taught, whom it should serve, and what it should accomplish.

Too often, students rate occupational facilities and offerings in second place. They see themselves as second-class college students; they become disillusioned. The seeds of discouragement are sown and germinate quickly into self-doubts or resentment against a system which loudly and grandly proclaims the dignity of labor while busily putting resources into programs designed for the few.

Something better must be designed and executed now, in time to prepare tomorrow's employees, and that something must also fit the expectations of the students.

Nearly a decade ago, G. Ross Henninger wrote, "*The junior college is at the threshold of a really significant participation in technical education.*"[5] Today, after nearly ten years — in spite of many studies, numerous plans, and a few sporadic efforts — the junior college is still "at the threshold."

---

[5]Henninger, G. Ross. *The Technical Institute in America.* New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959, p. 5. Quoted by Maurice W. Roney in his lecture "Curriculum Design in Technical Education."

CHAPTER III

The Rationale

"It is quite obvious that too much of education today is irrelevant to students' needs tomorrow. Too much of it is not education for today but education for yesterday. Social change has out-run education reform."[6]

— Nolan Albert

"Some men see things as they are
And say, 'Why?'
I dream things that never were
And say, 'Why not!' "[7]

— Robert Francis Kennedy

The picture of tomorrow's citizens and employees now seeking an education as presented in Chapter II was introduced to produce an awareness of their needs and to provide a rationale for change in general education in occupational curriculums.

Some Important Facts

Let us review the factors which are to become the rationale for determining the new program for occupational students. Many of the pivotal educational needs of occupational students fall in the area of general education. Tomorrow's employees will almost certainly spend more time off the job than on the job; as a result, preparation for off-the-job demands is needed. The probability of preparing for more than one kind of job in a working lifetime puts relatively less emphasis on preparation for the specific demands of the first job and more emphasis on the need for general education in occupational education. Having curriculums made to fit students' needs would be such an unusual experience that it might well improve their self esteem. It is known that there is a positive relation of the self-concept to achievement. There is no doubt that in our society the individual's sense of worth and identity is inextricably interwoven with his vocation. In the past, the offerings of colleges have been determined largely by habit or tradition. The junior college is bound by neither, and therefore should have the courage to draft a program which will provide the preparation which students will need in order to take their places in employment in tomorrow's society.

Any satisfactory program must be clearly defined, up to date, and must provide preparation for living as

[6]National Education Association. Nolan Albert. *Student Impact*, Washington, D. C.: the Association, April 1968. p. 1.
[7]Robert Francis Kennedy, quoted by Edward Kennedy in televised funeral tribute, June 8, 1968.

well as for working. We have long admitted that in most programs the lines of delineation for general education are vague; we have admitted that we don't entirely know what it is we are trying to do; we have admitted that programs now in use are inadequate and antiquated. A few have been courageous enough to say that these should be discarded, but are hazy about what should be put in their place.

"... it is that part of education which encompasses the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to be effective as a person, as a member of a family, as a worker, and as a citizen."

—— General education defined by B. Lamar Johnson, *Fifty-fifth Yearbook for the National Society for the Study of Education*, 1956.

For years we have emphasized that general education provides the common knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are needed — and we continue to do so. But is it possible that any of us, living in this space age, can insist that the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed today and tomorrow are the same as they were yesterday?

If we believe that general education is dynamic, expanding, and constantly changing, how do we dare offer yesterday's program today? We must study our offerings in general education in occupational programs and compare them with a revised concept which sees the sum total of all learning experiences — formal and informal, in and out of the classroom — which prepares the learner to play his multiple role in life.

The revised concept of general education sees it as more than what is to be taught and how much; it is also concerned with how it is taught, by whom, for what purpose, and under what circumstances.

The Problem

The problem is, "How can the programs become a satisfactory preparation for living and working in a fast-changing world?"

This concept must shape every occupational curriculum and permeate the entire college environment. In my estimation, we would move ahead faster and farther if we could bring ourselves to omit the use of the terms "academic" and "occupational" as we speak of junior college curriculums. What we should be talking about is the total educational program for an individual.

"A positive view of one's self is learned from the ways people treat the learner. People learn that they are able not from failure, but from success."

—— Arthur Combs, quoted by William Watson Purkey, *The Self and Academic Achievement*. Research Bulletin, Vol. 3 No. 1. Gainesville, Florida: Florida Research Education and Development Council, University of Florida. Spring 1967. p. 30.

It is general education that enables us to be free: free from ignorance and incompetence; free from the idea that learning and work are opposed; free to think, to discriminate between opinion and fact, to make decisions, to evaluate, to communicate effectively, to adapt, to be flexible, to adopt a value system, to love learning and to want to participate in a lifetime of learning; free to build our self-esteem; free to take our places in the employment world with dignity and distinction; free to play our multiple roles as human beings, as American citizens, and as tomorrow's employees and employers.

You've heard this before. Years ago the Educational Policies Commission declared that to learn to think is the central purpose of education. Educators endorsed

it, and continue to use it in their printed objectives; yet students at every level, including the entering occupational students in today's junior colleges, leave school unable to think for themselves. And the vote of a citizen unable to think for himself counts just as much as the vote of the thinker and the well informed. But we still seem to do nothing to incorporate these objectives into our curriculums.

Changes and Innovations

Let us consider some of the things which are needed. An orientation period is needed to acquaint the entering occupational student with the general education required by the new demands of business, industry, and labor as presented by their own representatives. Up-to-date occupational offerings need to be selected with the counsel of advisors from business and industry. One or more periods of on-the-job training are required during college training. There needs to be out-of-class opportunities to discuss and apply in-class learnings.

Opportunities in and out of of classes are needed to foster the intangibles: the cognitive skills, the attitudes, the self-concept — areas in which entering occupational students are known to be weak. Training for leisure activities is needed in and out of class. A great many people are not emotionally and psychologically ready for free time. General education in occupational curriculums can help this generation to take fuller advantage of such hours.

Flexibility is needed — enough to meet the individual needs of individual students. Much is heard today in education and industry about being concerned with individualization. The new program must put that idea into practice. There must be opportunities for all students to get acquainted with the best in aesthetic, literary, and intellectual areas of living; and opportunities for awakening community concern to develop community awareness and student involvement.

A policy is needed permitting all two-year occupational curriculums to lead to an associate degree, regardless of their comparison with the pattern of transfer programs. For students in the shorter programs there should be certificates of achievement or other recognition.

Nontechnical courses are needed in economics, social sciences, humanities, sciences, communications, physical education, and health. Each nontechnical course should have a special design enabling it to achieve the objectives of general education. Introductory courses designed for beginning majors, samplings, and survey courses are not generally acceptable.

Objectives for *all* courses should be in accord with the new concept of general education. (At this point I would like to remind you that courses in automechanics have been known to teach a student to think, whereas courses in humanities have been known to require a student *not* to think, but rather to memorize and feedback lecture material.) **First, last, and always, the objectives of general education need to be those dynamic ever-expanding, ever-changing influences permeating every phase of the student's life — formal and informal, in the classroom and out.**

The curriculum that I am proposing calls for a revision of the total college offerings to accomplish these objectives. It cannot be fulfilled by courses alone, nor by any magic number of hours for a course, nor by a percentage of the total, nor by any other requirement imposed by tradition only. A curriculum must be seen as something so pervasive that it influences the student in all his judgments, his decisions, values — his total functioning as a human being.

CHAPTER IV

The Proposal

"The chief challenge to us is to learn new arts
in the management of intellectual activity.
The old ways won't do."[8]
— A Junior College President

What is required to meet this challenge? If one word could answer this question, I would select the word "change." There must be change in the physical plant — in the arrangement and location of buildings; in the size and number of classrooms; in the size and plan of the libraries; and in the dimensions and plan of the corridors. There must be change in the offerings, both classroom and nonclassroom; change in the attitudes of personnel and in the techniques of teaching; change is the key.

I believe that the first and crucial question which you must face and answer is, " Do we *want* to change?"

Some of you will say, "No, we do not want to change; we are satisfied with what we are doing." Some of you will answer, "We are too new; we need time to develop; after that we can consider change." Some will say, "Yes, we want to change. How and where do we start?" For you, the following areas might be explored for change: the total offerings, the physical plant, the personnel, and the structure. For you the road will be rough. You will make mistakes. You will be criticized. You will have failures as well as some successes. But you will be establishing means by which your college will be creating an environment conducive to the development of a more productive and enlightened citizenry.

The Total Offerings

Take a look at what you are doing in the classroom. Check carefully to see if the content of each course is up to date. Check, also, to see whether attention is focused on the future when our students will be managing the new social order. Check the justification for each course on criterions other than habit and tradition, which alone can no longer justify offering a course. Check the appropriateness of each course as it relates to other courses in each curriculum. Above all, check them for their relevance to the life of the learner.

"As long as the life of the mind is not relevant to
the life of the learner he is not going to 'buy in.'"[9]
— J. A. Battles

Most of all it is necessary to acknowledge that "No subject matter is intrinsically important; its importance is derived from what it does to me and for a student and from what it enables him to do with his life."[10]

[8]Quoted by Roger H. Garrison in *Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. p. 23.

[9]Battles, J. A. *Culture and Education for the Contemporary World.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968. p. 35.

[10]Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education *The Individual and The System.* Boulder, Colorado: the Commission, November 1967. p. 86.

The Nonclassroom Environment. There are those who hold that student revolts are in part caused by a complete abandonment of students outside of class. Although the nonclassroom activities have a different function from those in the classroom, it does not mean that they do not contribute to learning. As a matter of fact, if this out-of-classroom behavior does not reflect improved patterns of thought, conduct, and values held, there is serious doubt as to whether or not the classroom exposure has had any real value.

One of the greatest needs for change is in the area of nonclassroom offerings. Such experiences must no longer be merely incidental, or limited to organizational activities, or to special programs. They must permeate every building and the farthest corners of the campus — wherever students congregate and manifest their need. All students must be involved — peer groups, student-teacher groups, twosomes, and perhaps the entire student body.

They will exchange ideas, prejudices, convictions about such diverse topics as music, art, current events and problems, movies, concerts, carry-overs from class, tennis matches, jobs, the generation gap.

Part of the background can be provided by stereo music piped into the laboratories, workshops, libraries, cafeterias. Some of you will be concerned at this suggestion and will say, "But that will distract the students from the learning that is going on in the classroom." Where is your commitment to change? Try it. Provide backgrounds of many types — soft, unobtrusive music, or rock-and-roll; or instant interiors through slide projectors. I suspect that rather than distracting the students backgrounds will prove to be an aid to learning — establishing a mood, a more relaxed atmosphere, in which ideas can be examined thoughtfully; stimulating and helping to overcome apathy and lethargy.

When I think about how the junior college merchandises its wares and compare what it is doing to the efforts which a supermarket, for example, makes, the college comes off a very poor second. I invite you to visit any local supermarket; see how carefully and precisely the shelves and produce are arranged; the care with which the shopping habits of the American buyers have been studied so that they are led on from one step to another, buying things which they had no intention whatsoever of purchasing, but cannot resist because the items are so attractively arranged.

Is it not possible that if the junior college studied the "buying" habits of its students and arranged its offerings more attractively that students might be tempted to "buy" courses which they now reject, and would participate more wholeheartedly in the out-of-classroom activities and experiences?

How do we market our wares in a typical junior college? Consider the catalog, for example. I have often thought that catalogs are written by registrars for the bemusement and mystification of other registrars. I defy the average student to pick up the average junior college catalog and plan a program of studies for himself. As a matter of fact, I defy the average faculty member to pick up the average college catalog and understand all that is written in it.

The college must make a deliberate attempt to provide experiences to compensate for many of the things which the student is denied in his home life. If the college does not attempt to provide such experiences where will the average student ever have the opportunity to experience things which will add new dimensions to his life?

Movies, concerts, and lecture series should be scheduled during the day. When students leave the junior college campus at the end of the day, they are gone. Many of them have night jobs and find it difficult to return for an evening program. Others lack transportation. If these things are important, why shouldn't they be scheduled during "prime time" so that the majority

of the student body can participate? Purely on the basis of economics, I doubt that we can really justify the expenditure of time and money for activities which attract only a minority of our student body.

Newspapers, paperbacks, and periodicals should be made available in many places so that students will find it easy and natural to pick them up and read them. Hopefully, these items will be take home by the students where others will read them! Put up signs — "Please steal me."

I would use video tape — a large amount of it — to record what is going on in many activities. I would record what the participating students do and say, how they look. Later when they see and hear themselves as others see and hear them, they are likely to be their own worst critics. They will see and hear the errors — in dress, in speech, in thought, in attitudes, in mannerisms. They are likely to talk about these errors in small groups and make plans to correct them, or will develop an individual plan to improve. This self-correction certainly will be much more effective than teacher- or counselor-prompted corrections.

A program of this type will go far toward ensuring that the students who leave your college will be better prepared for their adult responsibilities as American citizens and employees than those who have missed it. But such a program cannot be provided unless you understand and accept it so that you will allocate the resources that are needed to make it a reality.

The Physical Plant

First of all, the location must be sightly and attractive — something to which the student can point with pride and say, "That's my college," and to which the community can point and say with equal pride, "That's our college." I would make the total campus contribute to the "new arts in the management of intellectual activity" and thus to the objectives of general education. I see carpets, drapes, indirect lighting, flower boxes and potted plants, cheerfully painted and decorated classrooms. These places will be places which have appeal for students, places they will enjoy going to, places which provide experiences and influences which will affect their whole lives for the better.

I hold that it is a part of your commitment to see to it that the experiences of the college years on the total campus for all students are as enjoyable and fruitful as possible so that they have a better chance of becoming part of a lifelong pattern of living. Even the halls must contribute to the general education objectives. They need to be attractive, well-lighted, with walls lined with display cases where all kinds of items can be exhibited.

Do you have places on your campus, nurture nooks, which are well landscaped, with benches, which have a measure of semiprivacy so that students can sit alone or in small groups and reflect on who they are, where they are, where they are going, and how they can get there. A campus which in effect says, "Sit down for a while; why rush through the only life which you will probably have? Rest awhile, relax and enjoy the trip."*

Many fine engineering studies have been made about traffic patterns on campus — both vehicular and pedestrian — and the arrangements of buildings to facilitate student flow. As I study them I suspect that what many of these plans are saying is, "Get the students on the campus in a hurry and get them off in a hurry." I suggest that what we ought to be thinking about are arrangements which would slow down this too rapid scurry.

When classroom space is considered, new concepts of teaching must be taken into account. Is wisdom diminished as the number of listeners increases? Is the impact of an idea lessened in inverse proportion to the size of the class? Both common sense and recent research answer in the negative. Then why do we continue to build the traditional size classroom which holds thirty to forty students? There must be more

*Note: For a more detailed description of a nurture nook, see page 18 of *Premises: Planning Student Personnel Facilities*, by Charles C. Collins, printed in 1967 by AAJC.

large lecture rooms, more small seminar rooms, more rooms set up to accommodate multimedia and consoles for programmed instruction, and less regular size classrooms to provide for the new approaches in teaching and learning. In my estimation, these changes in the physical plant are sufficiently important to justify the cost. What do you think?

Personnel

The Service Personnel. The service personnel in the bookstore, and the cafeterias; the gardeners, yardmen, custodians, and operators of machinery, have the opportunity and the responsibility to participate in the education of today's youth. They need to say, along with the airline stewardesses, "Welcome aboard. I'm ready to serve you whenever you need me. I'm never too busy to come when you call." Lectures on good manners and common courtesy are common in many classrooms. These are fine. But why don't we supplement the spoken word by providing good examples of courtesy, graciousness, and good manners?

Counseling Personnel. Call them counselors or call them guidance workers, they fill a need peculiar to junior colleges where such a large percentage of the students come with no well-defined plans for their education. This is particularly true in the area of career guidance. These counselors are already student oriented. However, there is need for changes to be made in their work. Let me suggest four such changes.

1. More counselors are needed—1 counselor to every 1,200 students is absurd.

2. Counselors must have better training. Too many teachers whose only qualification is a desire to help are being required to cope with the guidance problems of their students.

3. A better image of the guidance program and better status for guidance workers are necessary. Too often they are referred to disparagingly by the faculty and administrators as "those people down the hall" or "those bleeding heart coffee drinkers." The image of the guidance personnel will be achieved, as I see it, only when the faculty and the administration accept them as professional colleagues who are using all of their skill, training, and understanding to make life fuller for each student. Furthermore, the counseling personnel can assist faculty in improving their counseling and advising skills.

4. More help from business, industry, and labor is needed, and it is to be had for the asking. Business, industry, and labor are eager to give colleges the benefit of what they know about job opportunities and the necessary qualifications to enter the job market and survive in the market. One of the most serious lacks in the guidance program, we are told, is the lack of up-to-date and comprehensive career information; yet business, industry, and labor have often gone to great expense and effort to make such information available.

Teaching Personnel. "The key to quality is the skilled, fully professional teacher. His needs and the problems he sees as most pressing must have first priority from administrators, boards, and the public."[11]

It is time for us to find out what kind of people do the teaching, how they do it, for what purpose, and the degree to which these purposes are achieved. Two types of circumstances have contributed to the need for changes in teaching techniques. The first is the unprecedented growth in enrollments. This has resulted in crowded classrooms, insufficient equipment and facilities, and harried, frustrated teachers so burdened by their many obligations that they have neither the time nor the energy to do the kind of work they want so much to do. I have never known a teacher who did not want to become a better teacher; but how much help do we usually furnish him? We are told that "lack of time" as his main professional problem is far too uniform and too insistent to be dismissed as either a complaint or a distortion of reality. Even if it were discounted by 50 per cent it would still pose vexing and far-reaching questions.

---

[11] Garrison, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

The second circumstance requiring change is that these teachers, most of whom have had little, if any, training for junior college teaching, and have had little or no training in how to present educational materials to huge groups of students with such extremely heterogeneous capabilities and motivations. These teachers have not been taught how to provide an educational program based on such varying and special individual characteristics. So they teach as they were taught, using materials that could be better read out of texts or, worse yet, using the notes from their graduate studies.

A majority of teachers come from colleges where good teaching was neither recognized nor rewarded. They were survivors in a system which screens out the less academically promising students so that they have no real understanding of the learning levels of the students whom they must face each day. Looking at the students from their own experience, they gear their instruction to the bright students, not really seeing that their teaching is appropriate to a type of student that they do not have and probably never will have in any numbers. Their teaching techniques must be changed.

One of the great needs is to provide in-service or summer training or some other plan — at the expense of the college — by which the faculty can learn the new arts in the management of intellectual activity.

Another need is for them to associate with their colleagues from other junior colleges so that they can discuss common problems and share instructional techniques and approaches. It is profitable to exchange ideas with colleagues in senior institutions up to a point so that the approaches in the subjects might have some things in common; but beyond that point there is not very much to be gained, from talking with one's counterpart in a senior institution because the students they teach are quite different from the students who enroll in the junior college.

What kind of teacher do we need in the junior college? Certainly, one who has a good background in his field, preferably with prior experience. Just as certainly he must have had contact with and be interested in the world about him. He must be widely read, have had many experiences, and be sensitive to the movements and changes in society. Hopefully, he is student oriented, and sensitive to the needs of students, and is concerned about meeting their needs. He should teach in the junior college because he has deliberately chosen this type of institution as the place where he can make his maximum contribution. He should be concerned about his subject, but he should be even more concerned about helping each student develop a state of mind which will nurture lifelong learning, the ability to think, to make decisions, to reason, to adjust, and to adapt. He should realize that the subject matter he is teaching may become obsolete, but that right attitudes toward work, learning and people will never be obsolete.

Current thinking suggests that it is not reasonable to expect each teacher to be proficient in a number of functions which are directly related to teaching. We believe that we should be preparing staff members who have specific assignments; for example, faculty who are interested in institutional research, particularly the type of research which can be channeled into the classroom and throughout the college to make learning more effective; faculty members who can take the findings of research and translate the data into courses, programs, curriculums, and into providing the out-of-classroom experiences which are needed for total growth; faculty who are particularly adept at stimulating and leading small group discussions; faculty who are proficient at lecturing to large groups where facts and theories need to be presented; and, finally, faculty who are especially trained and gifted in tutorial skills and the one-to-one relationship which is so paramount in good teaching and learning. Such a staff of differentiated members would provide the kind of team teaching approach which builds upon the strength of each individual teacher.

We must also make greater and more efficient use of computer-assisted instruction; in microteaching

where we present one single idea and in minicourses which furnish shorter units of information, fact, theories, ideas, so that students can more easily enroll in courses without having to wait an entire term before being admitted to a class. Such offerings may very well be the answer to some of the instructional problems in the occupational program where a single skill or a single concept is so often offered.

This type of teaching is particularly important for the junior college when we consider the kind of student who is enrolled in the junior college, and when we consider that research shows academically marginal students or below marginal students can learn effectively, but that it takes longer for them to absorb information and ideas. If the material is presented in shorter segments through minicourses and microteaching, such absorption is more likely to occur.

Classroom Structure

If life is to be given to the new concept of general education, if we are really interested in devising and promoting new arts in the management of learning activities, then changes are needed inside the classrooms. The traditional picture of rigid rows of chairs, so many in a row, with the teacher's desk in front and the teacher standing nearby is not in harmony with today's thinking about how learning takes place most effectively.

The new concept of the teacher's place in the classroom no longer sees him as the central figure, the one who is expected to dominate the entire situation, who knows all the answers, and does all the talking. It sees him as a friend, a guide, moving among the students pointing the way so that students can find their own answers and stimulating them to further areas of inquiry and discovery.

The courses need to be restructured to permit more active student participation, more opportunities for exploring ideas, exchanging information, sharpening thought, handling materials and equipment, challenging, and searching for meaning.

Always the focus must be on the end product — the student. Uniform time limits for units of learning are as obsolete as whalebone girdles. Why should all students be expected to learn at the same rate? Why bother to discover their individual differences if all are to be shunted onto the same track for the same period of time? And, grades? Today's all-consuming emphasis on grading and grades — those strangling, inhibiting, threatening accoutrements of today's classroom — must give way to learning.

Classrooms and classroom techniques and procedures must be changed to fit the needs of today.

Organizing for Action

One of the persistent problems in the junior college today is the schism between the faculty and students in the occupational programs and the faculty and students in the transfer programs. Perhaps one way of bridging the chasm between the two groups would be to restructure the organizational patterns of the college.

Looking at the occupational programs which are offered, it seems that we should consider setting up the divisions in the college somewhat along these lines:

- Communications and related technologies
- Behavioral science and related technologies
- Social sciences and related technologies
- Science and mathematics and related technologies
- Humanities and related techniques.

In other words, each division would include all technical offerings related to it. I believe that we could place each occupational program very appropriately in one of these divisions.

For instance, advertising layout, buying and purchasing, credit and collections, salesmanship may very well be allocated to the division of behavioral sciences and related technologies; many of the health-related occupations (the third largest industry) such as laboratory technician, radiologic technician, radioisotope technician fall very naturally in the division of science and mathematics and related technologies; data processing,

foods processing technician, soils technician, insurance, and real estate also fall in this division; many public and personal service occupations — social service aide, teacher aide, tour guide — fall in the division of social sciences and related technologies; all kinds of research occupations, receptionists, secretaries, office manager, are certainly related to communications. And so the list goes on, limited only by one's own ingenuity and willingness to try the plan.

If we did this, what might some of the outcomes be? Let me suggest a few:

1. Faculty members in related areas would be more likely to talk together than they do today because the structure would house them together. They would have an opportunity to rub shoulders, to discuss ideas across discipline lines, and to bring home to each teacher the realization that the education process is complex, inextricably interrelated, and that no one subject has a prior right to college resources.

2. It might encourage more exchange of faculty between the areas. Minicourses would lend themselves well to such a plan. The field is virtually unexplored and holds tremendous potential. For instance, an instructor of auto mechanics could teach a unit on circuitry in physics; an instructor of nursing could teach a unit on nutrition in chemistry or biology; an instructor of welding could teach a unit on metal sculpture in art.

3. The students would enroll in a division without indicating whether they were concerned primarily with the transfer program or the occupational program. These distinctions would lose their outlines.

4. The occupational students would perhaps feel that they "belong" in the college rather than, as is now true, thinking that they are second-class citizens.

5. The dean of instruction would furnish leadership to all of the programs; and, as he is the man who is best qualified by virtue of background, training, and experience to understand the instructional program, it is reasonable to assume that the instructional level would be raised.

6. Because the faculty in a transfer program would be more understanding of what the occupational faculty members are trying to do, they might be more inclined to include discussions of the job market and what their own specialty means in terms of succeeding on the job — regardless of what it is.

7. Resources could be allocated more efficiently to these broad, related areas.

8. The needs of all students would be considered in divisional meetings and our energies would be devoted to the needs of all students rather than as in our present plan where we spend 75 per cent of our time talking about the needs of 25 per cent of our students.

9. Those students who would be preparing themselves for one of the professions would leave our colleges with perhaps more appreciation of the employment than they would otherwise have. On the other side of the coin, those students who are preparing for nonprofessional levels of work would be more understanding of the demands which the professions make upon those who would enter their ranks.

10. Students could transfer — whatever the reason — from one goal to another within a division rather than being forced to leave one part of the college in order to enroll in a program with lesser prestige.

11. Counseling, particularly vocational counseling, should be more efficient because a wider range of possibilities would be open to a student within the same division.

12. Students who now enroll only in the college transfer program might be tempted to take some courses in the occupational area, as such work would be offered in the same division in which they are enrolled. Sampling such work would possibly equip them more completely for meeting their obligations as citizens and employees, mothers and fathers, home owners and employees of tomorrow.

If these suggestions are activated, the stage should be set to present general education in occupational programs as the sum total of all the experiences, opportunities, and resources which the college can offer.

CHAPTER V

The Challenge

I can think of no better way to personalize the challenge which these proposed changes carry than to draft an open letter to each and everyone of you who have it in your power to speed them along or to delay them.

Accordingly, I am writing to you — a member of the legislature: How often have you visited the campuses of the junior colleges? What do you really know about the junior college — its purposes and what it needs to achieve those purposes? How will you cast your ballot when the bills enabling the necessary resources for junior college changes come to a vote?

You, a member of a junior college board: Have you visited the campus other than for a board meeting? How well do you know the members of the faculty and the staff? What are the purposes of the college of which you are a steward? What are the curricular patterns offered in the college? What evidence do you have that the product of your college is the kind of person that you want to turn out?

You, the president: How informed are you about the curriculum of the college? What are your priorities for the college? Are you finding the time to canvass the campus to see that they are really needed? How many resources have you allocated to the college for the promotion of learning? Are you the president who complained that the future is upon us before solutions are found for today's problems?

You, the dean of instruction: What are your priorities for this year? You are the chief academic officer in your college. On what basis did you hire the faculty — degrees or demonstrated teaching ability? What good teaching occurred in your college this year? What procedures have you set up to appraise good teaching or to reward good teaching? What have you done to encourage the faculty to try new approaches? How many departmental meetings this past year were devoted to talking about teaching, what was being taught, how it was being taught, and how it could be done better? How many faculty meetings this past year centered on teaching? Does your structure promote or stifle effective teaching and learning? How much time and effort are you spending on improving instruction and on curriculum development?

You, the teacher: What good teaching went on in your class this past year? Why did it happen? Can you duplicate the situation so that it will occur again? What new approaches are you planning for next year? How important in your own list of priorities is teaching? Are you aware of the changes which are taking place in education and in your particular discipline? What growth actually occurred on the part of the students? Do you know what is happening to your students after they leave your college?

Only you in your several capacities working together can provide the answers and the means to improve the quality of general education in the community junior college.